



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,943	08/13/2004	Patrick R. Guido	014682.000012	4942
44870 7590 02/09/2007 MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM P.O. Box 13706 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			EXAMINER MINOR, CHERISSE K	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,943

Applicant(s)

GUIDO ET AL.

Examiner

Cherisse K. Minor

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/15/04 *CKM*
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-16, 19-23, 25-29, 31-36, 38-43, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian et al. ("Qian" US 2003/0145275) in view of Shahrababaki et al. ("Shahrababaki" US 2004/0113948).

As per independent claim 1, Qian teaches a portal environment (Figure 1—*portal* 16) comprising:

- at least one portal page (Paragraph 0011).

Qian teaches all of the above, but fails to teach that the at least one portal page is detachable. However, this feature is known in the art. For example, Shahrababaki teaches a multi-windowed environment that comprises at least one detachable page (*transferable tab presenting an opened object*—Paragraph 0010) and a detach feature associated with the at least one detachable page (*detach interface element in connection with the tab*—Paragraph 0020).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to allow the portal pages of the portal environment of Qian to be detachable as taught by Shahrabaki to provide the user with the ability to better manage available portal real estate (Shahrabaki—Paragraph 0006).

As per claims 2 and 3, Shahrabaki teaches that the detach feature comprises an icon (*button*) to transfer the at least one detachable page to an independently managed window in response to the window being activated (Paragraph 0020).

As per claim 4, Shahrabaki teaches a placeholder (*tab-head*) formed in the environment to represent the detached page (Paragraph 0021).

As per claims 6 and 9, Shahrabaki teaches a communication tunnel formable between the placeholder and the detached page (Paragraph 0021). The placeholder is a component of the environment; therefore there is tunneling communication between the environment and any detached page.

As per claim 7, Shahrabaki teaches that the detached page comprises a reattach feature to reattach the detached page in response to activating the reattach feature (Figure 3—*attach button 320*, Paragraphs 0035 and 0023).

As per claim 10, Qian teaches that the detachable portal of the portal environment comprises:

- at least one detachable portlet (Paragraph 0041); and
- a detach feature associated with the at least one detachable portlet (Figure 4—*detach feature 34*, Paragraph 0041).

As per claim 11, Qian teaches that the portal environment further comprises a

portlet window to receive a detached portlet in response to activating the detach feature (Paragraph 0041).

Claim 13 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1 and 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, the limitation of detaching a selected portlet in response to activating a portlet detach feature has been addressed in a previous paragraph, and thus would be applicable in a similar manner to this claim. Shahrabaki does not expressly state reattaching the detached portlet in response to activating a portlet reattach feature. Shahrabaki does suggest reattaching a detached window in response to activating a reattach feature (Paragraph 0023). A portlet is a window that manages its own graphical user interface; therefore the limitation taught by Shahrabaki is applicable to that claimed by the applicant.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1 and 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1 and 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 32 in addition to limitations described in the above rejection of claim 1, Qian teaches a system comprising a portal server (Figure 2—*server 202*; Paragraph 0033).

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, Qian teaches a portal database containing the at least one portal page (Paragraph 0032).

As per claim 39, Qian teaches a page aggregation element to organize and present the at least one portal page to a user accessing the associated portal environment (Paragraph 0033—*default skin, cascading style sheet and directory of images*).

Claim 40 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1 and 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 42 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 43 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 46 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claims 5, 8, 12, 17-18, 24, 30, 37, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian et al. ("Qian" US 2003/0145275) in view of Shahrabaki et al. ("Shahrabaki" US 2004/0113948) and further in view of Becker et al. ("Becker" US 6,981,223).

In respect to claim 5, Qian and Shahrabaki fail to teach that the placeholder comprises a reattach feature. Becker teaches a multiple messaging window management system wherein the main window comprises a reattach feature (Figure 13—*Dock Option* 1204) to reattach (*dock*) the detached portal page (*window pane*) to the portal environment (*window environment*) in response to activating the reattach feature (Figure 13, Column 19, lines 55-57).

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to combine Becker's teaching with the method of Qian and Shahrabaki to give the user an additional option for reattaching the detached portal page, which would be beneficial in an instance where the detached portal page is hidden.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 4, 5, and 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

In respect to claim 12 Shahrabaki does not expressly state that the placeholder formed in the main window is a portal placeholder. Shahrabaki does teach that the placeholder (tab) is representative of a detached window (Paragraph 0021). Shahrabaki also does not expressly state reattaching the detached portlet in response to activating a portlet reattach feature. Shahrabaki does suggest reattaching a detached window in response to activating a reattach feature (Paragraph 0023). As

Art Unit: 2174

described above, a portlet is a window that manages its own graphical user interface; therefore the limitations taught by Shahrabaki are applicable to those claimed by the applicant. In view of this reasoning, the limitation of claim 12 regarding a portlet reattach feature associated with the portlet placeholder is similar in scope to the limitations of claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17-18, 24, 30, 37, and 44-45 are similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cherisse K. Minor whose telephone number is 571-270-1287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:30 (Alternating Fridays Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cherisse K Minor
Examiner
Art Unit 2174

CKM *CKM*
01/30/07

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100